

REMARKS

I. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 6 and 9-16

Claims 1-4, 6 and 9-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,641,533 to Causey. These rejections are moot as claims 1, 6 and 9 have been amended.

"Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim." Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (citing Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 722 F.2d 1542, 220 USPQ 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983)). As set forth below, Causey fails to expressly or inherently disclose at least one element recited in each of the amended independent claims.

Disclosed in the present application is an access control system having an intelligent display and an interactive user interface (pages 6-7, paragraphs [0016]-[0017]). The user interface 207 can be used to monitor system activities and provide diagnostic information (page 22, paragraph [0064]). In addition, the user interface 207 can be used for maintaining all the information related to the access control system including retrieving a user's access information from a database 204, modifying such information, and uploading the modified information back to the database 204 (page 23, paragraph [0066]). The user interface as claimed is operable for at least maintaining, retrieving or modifying access control information of the access control system wherein said access control information is applicable to provide authorized users with access to a physical location (e.g., a secure room or confidential storage container, etc.) via a field device (e.g., card reader).

Causey does not expressly or inherently disclose an access control system or a user interface capable of maintaining, retrieving or modifying access control information where said access control information is applicable to providing authorized users with access to a physical location via the field device. To the contrary, Causey teaches that the device may be configured to restrict access to programming options. (column 9, lines 38-40). That is, the programming options are related to the operation of the device not access to physical

locations (e.g., secure room) via a field device (e.g., card reader). As Causey fails to expressly or inherently disclose an access control system or a user interface capable of maintaining, retrieving or modifying access control information where said access control information is applicable to providing authorized users with access to a physical location as recited in independent claims 1, 6 and 9, the Section 102 rejection of these claims should be withdrawn. Moreover, since claims 2-4 and 10-16 depend from and further limit claims 1, 6 and 9, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

II. Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance and, accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. Should any questions remain regarding the allowability of the application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Greenberg Traurig
3773 Howard Hughes Pkwy.
Suite 500 North
Las Vegas, Nevada 89109

Telephone : 702-792-3773
Facsimile : 702 792-9002

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

Rob L. Phillips
Registration No. 40,305

Date: July 9, 2007